

February 19, 2004

INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TPM 20725/ ER #03-02-007/ Ruffin Johnson

2. Description of Project:

The parcel is located at the end of Rancho Heights Road, Pala, CA, in the Pala-Pauma Community Plan within the unincorporated area of the County of San Diego. The project is a proposed subdivision of approximately 73-acres of undeveloped land creating 5 single-family residences on 4 lots and a remainder lot. The project proposes to grade 3000 cubic yards at maximum cut slope ratio of 1.5:1 and maximum height of 15 feet, and maximum fill slope ratio of 2:1 and maximum height of 15 feet.

The project additionally proposes the improvement of an already existing public road that winds through the property. Three of the five homes (lots 3,4,5) will require driveway access off the road, while the other two will have access directly off of Rancho Heights Road.

The project is proposing individual wells and septic systems to serve each lot making it groundwater dependant.

An open space easement for the preservation of biological resources will be granted conserving a total of 32.54-acres of scrub oak-chaparral and 1.61-acres of southern coast live oak riparian forest.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Hadley Johnson
129 W. Fig Street
Fallbrook, CA 92028
(760) 728-1134

4. Project Location:

The project is located at the end of Rancho Heights Road in Pala, California. This location is within the Pala-Pauma Community Plan within the unincorporated area of the County of San Diego.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 999, Grid 5/J

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The areas surrounding the project site are predominantly undeveloped rugged mountain terrain. There are single-family homes being built on subdivisions to the south along Rancho Heights Road. Public roads are paved throughout Rancho Heights Road, along with utility lines and fire hydrants.

The project site is mostly steep slopes, rock formations, chaparral, scrub oaks and other native vegetation. Rancho Heights Road continues throughout the entire property as an unimproved dirt access road.

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Pala-Pauma
Land Use Designation:	Multiple Rural
Density:	1du/4,8,20 gr. acres

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	A70 Limited Agriculture
Density:	.25 du/4 acre(s)
Special Area Regulation:	N/A

8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Biological Resources

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650
San Diego, California 92123-1666

10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:

Lori Spar (858) 694-8838

11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Tentative Parcel Map	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
School District Approval	Fallbrook School Districts
Fire District Approval	County of San Diego-CDF Ricon Station

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:

California Department of Fish and Game

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

Lori Spar, DPLU Environmental Analyst
Sami Raya, Current Planner
Laura Maghsoudlou, DPLU Staff Geologist
Murray Wunderly, Groundwater Geologist
Susan Hoang, DPW Staff Engineer
Megan Hamilton, DPLU Staff Biologist

14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment. However, the mitigation measures described in the attached Environmental Analysis Form have been added to the project which clearly reduce the potentially significant effects to a level below significance. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

LORI SPAR, Environmental Analyst
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
Regional Planning Division

Date: February 19, 2004

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: February 19, 2004

PROJECT NAME: Ruffin-Johnson Minor Subdivision

PROJECT NUMBER(S): TPM 20725

EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

"Potentially Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes.

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

"Not Applicable." County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

No.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 2.4 Non-Urban Residential and General Plan Land Use Designation (18) Multiple Rural. The General Plan allows for minimum parcel sizes of 4, 8, or 20 acres depending on the slope of the project. Parcels 1 and 2 measure greater than 8 acres and each have an average slope less than 25 percent. Parcels 3, 4, and the Designated Remainder measure greater than 8 acres and each have an average slope between 25 and 50 percent gradient. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes consistent with the General Plan.

The project is subject to the policies of the Pala-Pauma Subregional Plan. The subregional plan plans for an orderly expansion of growth based on the availability of essential services such as water, sewer, fire protection, and schools. The project is a minor subdivision of 73.8 acres into 4 parcels and a Designated Remainder. The parcels are planned for residential use and will be serviced by private water, private sewage disposal systems, the Rincon CDF, and the Fallbrook Elementary and High School Districts. The proposed parcel sizes and subdivision design are consistent with the surrounding community. The proposed project is therefore consistent with the policies of the Pala-Pauma Subregional Plan.

The current zone is A70, Limited Agriculture Use Regulation, which requires a net minimum lot size of 4 acres. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum parcel size because each parcel within the subdivision measures greater than 4 acres.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

In the review of the project, no conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies have been identified. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed use will not have a harmful effect on the neighborhood character because the area surrounding the project site is zoned A70, Limited Agriculture with a 4 acre minimum and is developed with residential land uses; few parcels remain in their vacant state. Many parcels to the north, east, and northeast of the project site are new subdivisions where development of single-family homes is currently occurring; parcel sizes range from 5-72 acres in size where the larger parcels are mainly undeveloped. Parcels to the south of the project site that are privately owned measure approximately 40 acres in size and the Pala Indian Reservation lies adjacent to the project site and measures greater than 530 acres. The larger parcels to the west of the project site mostly are vacant and measure between 38 and 76 acres in size, however the few parcels that are developed with residential land uses measure approximately 8 acres in size. The proposed project is for a residential land use proposing parcel sizes between 10.2 to 18 acres in size. Therefore, this project will be compatible with the existing character of development and planned land use.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project is a minor subdivision that does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the rural character of the community. The proposed project will not require the introduction of new utilities to the area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California

Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. In addition, the proposed project site does not support prime agricultural soils, as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

Less than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. In addition, the project and surrounding area is the land under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan. The project will not induce substantial growth that is not consistent with County planning goals.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project will not displace existing residential uses because the site is vacant. The addition of 5 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a site visit conducted by

Lori Spar on February 28, 2003, did not identify any features that would indicate landslides or the potential for liquefaction.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Cienega Rocky Course Sandy Loam (CmE2) and Acid Igneous Rock (AcG). The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. The project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion potential.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified no soils on the site which have a HIGH shrink-swell behavior. All mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior. Therefore, on-site soil conditions are stable and do not have adverse potential for development activity.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

On a site visit completed by Lori Spar on February 28, 2003, no significant geological features were identified on-site. No known unique geologic

features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Since no unique geologic features are present on the site, no adverse impacts will result from the proposed project.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project will not result in a loss of availability of a known significant mineral resource that would be of value to the region. The project is not located in a significant mineral resource area, as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996). Also, on a site visit conducted by Lori Spar on February 28, 2003, no past or present mining activities were identified on the project.

V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB).

2. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project lies in the Pala hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit - that is impaired for Coliform bacteria and nutrients.

The project is a subdivision creating four lots and a remainder. The project does not anticipate a significant increase in any pollutant for which the water body is impaired. A minor SWMP dated July 3, 2003, identifies BMPs that will be employed to address any construction or post-construction pollutants that may result from the project. Through the implementation of the BMPs, any pollutant run-off would have a less than significant impact on impaired water body.

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project proposes the use of groundwater. Therefore, the project will not have any impact on the local imported water supply.

4. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

According to the Drainage study received on July 3, 2003. The proposed project does not appear to substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site. Drainage will flow in pre-development drainage pattern.

5. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

According to the Drainage study received on July 3, 2003. The proposed project will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Drainage will flow in pre development drainage pattern.

6. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

According to the Drainage study received on July 3, 2003. The proposed project will not create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Drainage will flow in pre development drainage pattern.

7. Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Water quality objectives have been designated for waters of the San Diego Region by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as outlined in chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Pala hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the split of a 73.11 parcel into four lots and a remainder lot sized between 10.2 to 19.8 acres for single family resident development and could have the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities, improved roadway, creation of driveways and construction of other impervious surfaces.

However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: permanent landscaping, asphalt concrete poured over disturbed areas designated as roadways and driveways, outlet protection/ velocity dissipation devices, and creation of new walkways/ trails with permeable surfaces to allow infiltration.

Based on the above, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact should not cause or contribute to receiving water quality objectives nor substantially degradation of beneficial uses.

8. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff not identified above or in the submitted Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects. In addition the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite.

19. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

As identified within Section 67.722A of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance, it has been determined that groundwater resources are adequate to meet the groundwater demands of the project

and thus, the project will not adversely impact groundwater availability. Specifically, the project proposes lots greater than five acres in an area receiving mean annual precipitation of 18 to 21 inches.

10. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project proposes to increase the amount of impervious surfaces onsite to approximately 2.7% of the total site area. This should not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. In addition, groundwater recharge is not listed as a beneficial use for water resources in the Pala hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit

VI. AIR QUALITY

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

No significant source of either stationary or indirect air pollutants has been identified from the project. The primary source of air pollutants would be generated from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 60 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Therefore, the vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No other potential sources of air pollutants have been identified from the project. Additionally, the project is not expected to emit any toxic air contaminant or particulate matter based on project description and information submitted.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

Based on a site visit conducted on February 28, 2003 by Lori Spar, the project is not located near any identified source of noxious emissions and will not expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the level of service (LOS) of affected roadways. Pala Tamecula Road (SC 110) is designated as a Rural Collector Road on the San Diego County Circulation Element of the General Plan with a current LOS B (3,000 average daily trips (ADT)). The traffic volume from the project is 60 ADT (12 ADT/DU x 5 DU) and would result in a total of 3,060+/- ADT. This is not considered a significant impact since it will not cause degradation, or a threshold increase on Pala Tamecula Road.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project will not have any potential impacts to traffic safety. A private engineer will certify that the project does not have any significant impacts on traffic safety, adequate sight distance has been provided at the access driveways prior to final occupancy (see condition B.3 in the Department of Public Works (DPW) Preliminary Draft Requirements letter) and that all driveways are built to County and Fire Protection District standards (see condition B.4 & C.1 in the DPW Preliminary Draft Requirements letter)

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project will not have any significant increase in the volume of traffic on Pala Tamecula Road or any other County roads in the area. The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, nor will it affect existing conditions on Pala Tamecula Road or any other County road in the area for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain or improve existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.**DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:**

The 73.8-acre site supports 72.19 acres of scrub oak chaparral and 1.61 acres of Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest. No endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species were observed onsite. Habitat assessments for the Quino Checkerspot Butterfly and the Arroyo Toad concluded that the project site did not support suitable habitat for either species.

The entire area of Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest along with 32.54 acres of scrub oak chaparral will be placed in an open space easement prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first, and therefore no significant impact to these habitats will occur. In addition, the Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest will be protected with a minimum 50 ft biological buffer and a 100 ft limited building zone easement.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers?

Less Than Significant Impact.**DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:**

The site contains a County RPO wetland that also qualifies as a wetland under state and federal agencies. The entire area of the RPO wetland including the associated Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest will be placed in an open space easement prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first. The wetland will be protected with a minimum 50 ft biological buffer. Additionally a 100 ft limited building zone easement will separate the wetland and buffer from proposed development to the north. All of the habitat south of the wetland is in open space. Therefore, in accordance

with County ordinance and policy, there will be no net loss of wetlands and therefore no significant impact will occur.

3. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project site contains an intermittent blue line stream that traverses the property from east to west at its southern end. This wetland will not be impacted, and the proposed development will not discharge into and/or restrict or divert the movement of any known watershed including, but not limited to, rivers, lakes, streams, creeks, channels, or wetlands where the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction over. The project proposes complete avoidance of all jurisdictional waters and wetlands by placing these watersheds in a biological open space easement with an appropriate biological buffer of at least 50 ft. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur to wetlands or watersheds that are California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional waters.

4. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The only feature that would function as a minor wildlife corridor onsite is the east-west drainage that traverses the southern end of the property. The entire area including an adequate buffer will be placed in an open space easement prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first, and therefore no significant impact will occur. In addition, scrub oak chaparral that covers the steep rocky slopes onsite will be placed in open space (varying in width from over 1000 ft to 600 ft) and will allow for wildlife movement in an east-west direction across the property that generally follows an existing ridgeline.

IX. HAZARDS

1. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In addition, an internal review of existing data and a field visit to the project site did not indicate the presence of any historic burnsites, landfills, or uses that may have contributed to potential site contamination. Therefore, no significant hazard to the public or the environment is expected to occur due to project implementation.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project will not significantly increase the fire hazard because it will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and

Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter, dated February 5, 2003, has been received from the County of San Diego.

4. a. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project will not expose people or property to flooding because it does not propose to impair, impede or accelerate flow in any watercourse. The project does not have significant flood hazards from external sources.

- b. Does the project comply with the Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it located near any watercourse, which is plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

5. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

6. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

7. Is the project within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a quantity equal to or greater than that specified in subdivision (a) of Section 25536 of the Health and safety Code? Or, does the project involve the proposal of a school that is within one-quarter mile of a facility that exhibits the above characteristics?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project is not located within any airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that has not adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

9. For project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Not Applicable.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (1 mile) of a private airstrip. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

X. NOISE

1. Would the proposal result in exposing people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposal would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

2. Would the proposal generate potentially significant adverse noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposal would not generate potentially significant adverse noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise

Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposal create potentially significant adverse effects on, or result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities? This could include a significantly increased maintenance burden on fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public services or facilities. Also, will the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Fallbrook Elementary School District, Fallbrook Union High School District, and the County of San Diego- CDG Rincon Station. The service letters are based on the project's ability to meet the requirements set by these agencies.

The schools indicate that the project is located entirely within the district and is eligible for service.

The fire district indicates that the project is located in the district and is eligible for service. Based on the capacity and capability of the district's existing and planned facilities, fire protection facilities are currently adequate or will be adequate to serve the proposed project. The expected emergency travel time to the proposed project is greater than 15 minutes, which is less than the anticipated 20 minute emergency travel time established in the Public Facilities Element of the General Plan.

The project is accessed by an existing 60 foot private road easement; therefore, emergency access is adequate.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;
Communication systems;

Water treatment or distribution facilities;
Sewer or septic tanks;
Storm water drainage;
Solid waste disposal;
Water supplies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project will not result in the need for significant new distribution systems or substantial alterations to existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the proposed project. On-site wells and septic systems will provide water and sewage disposal. See Section XI for specific details on availability and/or conditions.

XIII. AESTHETICS

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project is not visible from a designated scenic vista, overlook or viewpoint according to the Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan; therefore, a demonstrable potentially significant adverse effect is not foreseen.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable potentially significant adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, and or excessive grading (cut/fill slopes) or any other negative aesthetic effect?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

The proposed project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project site has an existing average slope of 30.6 percent gradient and is currently undeveloped, however there is an existing dirt access road that traverses the property. Minor grading will be required for

the improvement of the access road and the creation of the building pads and private driveways. The Preliminary Grading plan dated October 9, 2003 indicates that the project grading will result in a balanced cut and fill volume of 13,986 cubic yards. Slope heights for parcels 1 and 2 will not exceed 25 feet in height those on parcels 3, 4, and the Designated Remainder will not exceed 15 feet in height. Therefore, the resultant development will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading.

3. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCES USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER

The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

Less Than Significant Impact.

DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

2. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
 - a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;

- b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
- c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;
- d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
- e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

Less Than Significant Impact.**DATA SOURCE USED AND RATIONALE FOR ANSWER:**

The staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, has reviewed project photographs, maps, and the County of San Diego archaeology/biology resource files and determined the property does not contain significant archaeological resources.

XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE

None.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- 1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

As discussed in Section VIII, Biological Resources, Questions 1., 2., 3., and 4., and Section XIV, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Questions 1., and 2., the project will not degrade the quality of the

environment and through mitigation measures will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. The project will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and will not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Also, the project would not reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal and will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that no significant unmitigated environmental impacts will result from the project. Thus, all long-term environmental goals have been addressed.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less Than Significant Impact

The incremental impacts of the project have not been found to be cumulatively considerable after an evaluation of all potential impacts. After careful review, there is no substantial evidence that any of the incremental impacts of the project are potentially significant. The impacts of the project have therefore not been found to be cumulatively considerable. The potential combined environmental impacts of the project itself have also been considered in reaching a conclusion that the total cumulative effect of such impacts is insignificant.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV,

Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: None.
2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: N/A.
3. Mitigation measures: N/A

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

Biological Resources and Wetland Survey and Report, William T. Everett, September 2003

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701 through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b, Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through 36.437)

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426, County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.), February 20, 2002

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300 through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Hydrology Study and Hydraulic Calculations, Hadley Johnson, July 2003

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, Hadley Johnson, July 2003

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San
Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of
Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology

ND0204\0302007-ISF;tf